arXiv:1512.08759v1 [hep-th] 29 Dec 2015

Inflationary field excursion in view of Kähler Moduli II inflation

Argha Banerjee[a)] and Ratna Koley[b)1]

Department of Physics,

Presidency University,

86/1 College Street,

Kolkata - 700 073, India

We address the issue of how much the field excursion variable, $\Delta\phi$ can change for a given set of inflationary parameters as obtained from latest CMB observations. We use various classifications of inflationary models by means of their large-N behaviour where N is the number of e-folds. Observationally there is no upper bound on the number of e-foldings for an inflationary model. In this work it has been shown that it is possible to have an upper bound on N for the range of inflation between horizon exit and its end. This in turn translates into an upper bound on the field excursion $\Delta\phi$. The entire work has been performed considering the Kähler Moduli inflation II (KMIII) model as the reference and comparing with the other universality classes of models. It has been explored the possibility of having super-Planckian and sub-Planckian field excursions within the framework of single field slow roll inflation.

[a)] E-mail: arghabanerjee62@gmail.com

[b)] E-mail: ratna.physics@presiuniv.ac.in

I. INTRODUCTION

The standard big bang cosmology has been proved to be successful in explaining the observed evolution of the universe albeit some extremely fine tuned initial conditions. The era of cosmological inflation[1,2] was introduced to take care of such initial conditions which gives a very nice proposal for the solution to the horizon problem, flatness problem and an explanation for the non existence of magnetic monopoles. Without inflation the standard big bang cosmology would remain incomplete and highly unsatisfactory. In the framework of General Relativity, inflation is produced by considering a scalar field (inflaton) with sufficiently flat potential. The most salient feature of inflation is the quantum fluctuations in the inflaton field that render seeds for CMB temperature fluctuations and drive the growth of the large scale structures[3,4] that we see today. Recent cosmological data[5] indicates that the power spectrum of the density perturbations is nearly scale invariant, which is apparent from the value of the spectral index, $n_s = 0.968 \pm 0.006$. Planck[5] took cosmologists by surprise by predicting almost a Gaussian nature of the power spectrum and putting a strong upper bound on the amplitude of primordial gravity waves during inflation, $r < 0.12$.

The amount of inflation that has been occurred is measured by the total number of e-foldings given by

$$N = N_* - N_f = \int_{a_*}^{a_f} d\ln a \tag{1}$$

where N_* and N_f are the number of e-folds at the horizon exit and at the end of inflation respectively and the scale factor is given by a. For the solution of the horizon problem, it is required to achieve at least 50 e-foldings in the conventional inflationary scenario. So observationally we can only fix a lower limit for N but there is no compelling evidence of any upper limit on the total amount of inflation[6]. In fact it may extend a long way further into the past than the present horizon size. On the other hand the inflaton potential can be constrained by the CMB observations but the physical origin of the inflaton and its relation with the Standard Model of particle physics are the subtle issues. Therefore it is interesting to study the natural likelihood of the models of inflation. Several prescriptions have already been put forward in this direction[9,17]. Here we would like to point out that given an inflaton which is able to reproduce the observed cosmological parameters such as n_s, α_s and r, how much field excursion $\Delta\phi = |\phi_* - \phi_f|$ will be there. It has been demonstrated in[10,11] that all single-field, slow roll inflationary models whose slow roll parameters scale with 1/N or a

higher power can be classified into two broad categories, characterised by a single parameter $\Delta\phi$. This puts forward a nice idea by expressing the inflationary observables in terms of the number of e-foldings in the range of inflation from horizon crossing of a particular mode to the end inflation. It groups the models of inflation into broad classes like constant, perturbative, non-perturbative and logarithmic. This provides with a more effective way of studying the inflationary models instead of doing the case-by-case analysis.

In this work we choose a model, with strong field theoretical background which passes successfully through the cosmological constraints, as the reference/benchmark and analyze the implications of observational parameters on the field excursion. Let us consider the model with one of the Kähler moduli playing as inflaton when internal spaces are weighted projective spaces in type IIB string theories[14]. The version with the canonically normalized inflaton field known as Kähler Moduli II (KM II) inflaton[15] has been chosen. In[7] the benchmark has been tagged with the chaotic inflationary scenario (with r > 0.12)[8]. However the minimal chaotic models are almost ruled out after Planck 2015. In addition to that the BICEP2 results have also been discredited, therefore one cannot be sure about the benchmark status of the chaotic model. We are interested to explore the effect of n_s and r on the field excursion by considering the observational bounds set by Planck[5]. Now the KMIII model gives very low value of r, thus this model gives a sub-Planckian field excursion. Our intention is to see whether the sub-Planckian excursion of the field (as seen in KMIII) remains sub-Planckian when we compare with the other classes of inflation or it becomes super-Planckian.

In section II we study the large N expansion and the observational parameters in the context of KMII inflation. Considering this slow roll parameters as reference we compare them with the slow roll parameters of the different categories of models, *i.e.* perturbative, non-perturbative and logarithmic class in section III. Once the slow roll parameters are set this effectively fixes the n_s and r of the inflationary models. It is apparent from the Eq.(5) that the dependence is only via the slow roll parameters. Now that the inflationary parameters are fixed we find how the total no. of e-folds N and the field excursion $\Delta\phi$ get affected.

II. ASYMPTOTIC HUBBLE FLOW FUNCTIONS IN KM II INFLATION :

The inflaton for the KM II model[14,15] is given by

$$V(\phi) = V_0 \left[1 - \alpha \left(\frac{\phi}{M_{Pl}}\right)^{4/3} \exp\left(-\beta \left(\frac{\phi}{M_{Pl}}\right)^{4/3}\right)\right] \tag{2}$$

Making use of the typical orders of magnitude one can write the parameters α and β as

$$\alpha = \mathcal{O}\left(\mathcal{V}^{5/3}\right), \qquad \beta = \mathcal{O}\left(\mathcal{V}^{2/3}\right) \tag{3}$$

where the quantity $\mathcal{V}$ represents the Calabi-Yau volume. The potential starts from a maximum, $V = V_0$ at $\phi = 0$, then reaches the minimum at $\frac{\phi}{M_{Pl}} = \beta^{-3/4}$ and finally asymptotes to $V = V_0$ for $\frac{\phi}{M_{Pl}}$ approaching to ∞. Maintaining the consistency with reheating, the slow-roll predictions for the KM II model of inflation can be achieved for $\mathcal{V} \in [10^5, 10^7]$ and thus the parameters α and β can have values in the range $\alpha \in [2.15 \times 10^8, 4.64 \times 10^{11}]$ and $\beta \in [2.15 \times 10^3, 4.64 \times 10^4]$. It can be shown that the Hubble slow roll predictions do not depend significantly on their vales[9]. We now intend to find out the Hubble flow functions ϵ_n defined as[18]

$$\epsilon_{n+1} = \frac{d}{dN} \log|\epsilon_n|, \qquad n \geq 0 \tag{4}$$

for large N in case of KM II model of inflation. The above functions basically play the role of slow roll parameters in standard formulation in terms of ϕ. Here ϵ_0 is nothing but the Hubble parameter and the range of inflation N runs from horizon crossing at ϕ^* to the end of inflation where the slow-roll conditions are violated. From the above equation (4) it is apparent that the successive Hubble flow functions are related to the derivatives of the potential $V(\phi)$. Consequently the slow roll parameters can also be expressed in terms of the Hubble flow parameters varying as $1/N^p$ for some values p at leading oder in the limit of large N. Further at first order in ϵ_n one can represent the CMB observables of inflation as

$$n_s = 1 + \epsilon_2 - 2\epsilon_1 \tag{5}$$

$$r = 16\epsilon_1 \tag{6}$$

where here ϵ_1 and ϵ_2 are evaluated at the time of horizon crossing. As has been noticed by Lyth[19] the tensor to scalar ratio of temperature fluctuations can be related to the change of the inflaton field while the cosmologically relevant modes exit the horizon as given below

$$\frac{1}{M_{Pl}} \frac{d\phi}{dN} \sim \sqrt{\frac{r(N)}{8}} = \sqrt{2\epsilon_1}. \tag{7}$$

Assuming $r(N)$ to be invariant throughout the phase of inflation it can be shown that[19,20] the field excursion is

$$\Delta\phi \approx \left(\frac{r}{0.002}\right)^{1/2} \left(\frac{N_*}{58}\right) M_{Pl} \tag{8}$$

where N_* is the number of e-folds at the horizon exit which is set 58 following the Planck[5] pivot scale. It is apparent from the above equation (7) that for $r < 0.002$ we have $\Delta\phi < M_{Pl}$ leading to sub-Planckian field excursion while for $r > 0.002$ we get super-Planckian field excursion. As a result one can distinguish the inflationary models in terms of the field excursion variable.

Let us calculate the Hubble flow functions for the model given in (4). These are of singular importance for the rest of the paper. The first function is given as

$$\epsilon_1 = \frac{b}{2N^2\sqrt{\ln N}} \tag{9}$$

where $b = \frac{9}{16}\frac{1}{\beta^{3/2}}$ and the second Hubble flow function is given by

$$\epsilon_2 = -\frac{2}{N}. \tag{10}$$

The fundamental features of the model has been captured by the above functions at the leading order of N. Therefore it becomes interesting to compare the above parameters with that of the various universality classes of inflation. From now on the quantities of the benchmark model will be denoted by an overhead bar to differentiate it from the analogous quantities of the other classes of inflation and choose to work with $M_{Pl} = 1$.

We take three values of $\mathcal{V} = 10^5, 10^6$ and 10^7 for our analysis, leading to the values of $b = 5.63 \times 10^{-6}$, 5.63×10^{-7} and 5.63×10^{-8} respectively. As most of the inflation takes place at large values of N we can consider N_f to be negligibly small and thus $\bar{N}_* \approx 58$ is justified. Let us define a quantity

$$\epsilon_{1*} = \frac{b}{2\bar{N}_*^2\sqrt{\ln \bar{N}_*}} \tag{11}$$

which is the value of the first Hubble flow parameter at horizon crossing and $\bar{N}_*$ is the no. of e-folds at that point of time. This we would like to use in future correspondences.

III. COMPARISON OF FIELD EXCURSION IN DIFFERENT CLASSES OF INFLATON

We look how the field excursion of the inflationary models vary for a given set of values of the CMB observables n_s and r. It will be interesting to explore whether the field excursion $\Delta\phi$ and the number of e-folds N remains the same or change. The large N behaviour of wide classes of inflationary models have been discussed in rigor detail in[10,11] by finding the dependence on N for the Hubble flow parameters. A leading order $1/N^p$ behaviour for the slow roll parameter ϵ is considered as the perturbative class. In addition to that there are constant, non-perturbative and logarithmic classes. For three of these, we will find the leading order approximation to the first and second Hubble flow parameters and equating those to the respective values for the KM II model we will compare field excursion for given set of spectral tilt and tensor to scalar ratio.

A. Perturbative Class

An attractive feature of these classes of models is that the $1/N$ term provides a natural explanation for the percent variation from the scale invariance of the CMB power spectrum. Chaotic, hilltop, inverse hilltop, Whitt potentials are typical examples of this particular class. The first two Hubble flow parameters of the perturbative class are given by[11]

$$\begin{aligned} \epsilon_1 &= \frac{\mu}{N^p} \\ \epsilon_2 &= -\frac{p}{N} \end{aligned} \tag{12}$$

where μ and p (≥ 1) are the parameters for different values of which one gets different types of models within this class. The above parameter values, determined by comparing with the respective Hubble flow parameters for the benchmark model, are given by

$$\begin{aligned} \epsilon_1 &= \frac{b}{2\bar{N}^2\sqrt{\ln \bar{N}}} \\ \epsilon_2 &= -\frac{2}{\bar{N}} \end{aligned} \tag{13}$$

Note that an overhead bar has been used for the benchmark model. Equating the expressions in Eqs. (12) and in Eqs.(13) at horizon crossing we get

$$\mu = \frac{bN_*^p}{2\bar{N}_*^2\sqrt{\ln \bar{N}_*}} \tag{14}$$

where

$$N_* = \frac{p\bar{N}_*}{2} \tag{15}$$

Now comparing equations (14) and (15) we obtain the expression for μ in terms of p and the parameter values in the benchmark model.

$$\begin{aligned}\mu &= \frac{b}{2}\left(\frac{p\bar{N}_*}{2}\right)^p \times \frac{1}{\bar{N}_*^2\sqrt{\ln \bar{N}_*}} \\ &= \epsilon_{1*}\left(\frac{p\bar{N}_*}{2}\right)^p \end{aligned} \tag{16}$$

Figure 1 depicts how the parameter μ behaves for different range of p according to Eq. (16).



FIG. 1. The parameter μ at first increases very slowly with p before it increases rapidly after $p > 4$. Here we take three values of ϵ_1^* as obtained from Eq. (11) for three values of β as $\beta = 2.15 \times 10^3, 2.15 \times 10^4, 2.15 \times 10^5$.

We see that one can get the same values of b for a range of values of μ and p. What do we actually mean by having same value of b ? As is apparent from Eqs. (9) and (10) that for a particular value of b the slow roll parameters of the KMIII model are fixed. Also as we fix the values of the slow roll parameters of the perturbative model with that of the KMIII model this in turn means that the slow roll parameters of the perturbative model and thus subsequently the values of the spectral index n_s and tensor-to-scalar ratio r are fixed while μ and p changes.

Let us turn our attention to the number of e-folds N within the range of horizon exit to the end of inflation. As is apparent from the definition in Eq. (4), the end of inflation can be associated with the first Hubble flow parameter $\epsilon_1 = 1$. N_f can thus be determined from the above mentioned condition. From Eq. (12) we get

$$N_f = \mu^{1/p} \tag{17}$$

Using the above value of N_f one can easily obtain the number of e-folds as

$$N = \frac{p\bar{N}_*}{2}\left[1 - \epsilon_{1*}^{1/p}\right] \tag{18}$$

Figure (2,3) show the behaviour of N changing with p according to the Eq. (18). It is



FIG. 2. N increases linearly for low values of p. Here we take three values of ϵ_1^* as obtained from Eq. (11) for three values of β as $\beta = 2.15\times10^3, 2.15\times10^4, 2.15\times10^5$.



FIG. 3. N approaches a maximum value for high values of p. Here we take three values of ϵ_1^* as obtained from Eq. (11) for three values of β as $\beta = 2.15\times10^3, 2.15\times10^4, 2.15\times10^5$.

interesting to note that a maximum limit on the value of N is reached asymptotically with p. Initially increasing linearly with p the number of e-folding N saturates for large values of p. For a wider range of perturbative class of models N can not exceed more remarkably hinting towards an upper bound on the number of e-foldings of inflation. There is therefore a strong degeneracy among the models in the perturbative class compared in terms of the number of e-foldings.

The field excursion as defined in Eq. (7) comes out to be

$$\Delta\phi = \frac{2\sqrt{2\beta}}{2-p}\left(N_*^{1-p/2} - N_e^{1-p/2}\right) \tag{19}$$

for the perturbative class. Putting in the values of N_f and N_* we obtained in Eqs. (15) and (17) we get

$$\Delta\phi = \frac{\sqrt{2}}{2-p}(pN_*)\epsilon_{1*}^{1/2}\left[1 - \epsilon_{1*}^{\frac{2-p}{2p}}\right] \tag{20}$$

Let us depict the Eq. (20) graphically in Fig. (4) and (5) showing the variation of $\Delta\phi$ with respect to p. It is clear from the figures that $\Delta\phi$ starts out as sub-Planckian ($\Delta\phi < M_{Pl}$) for small values of p before it becomes equal to 1 (as we have chosen to work with $M_{Pl} = 1$)

at about $p = 4$. We then see a continuous increase in $\Delta\phi$ as p increases before saturating at high values of p. This also shows an upper bound on the value of the field excursion similar to what we obtained for the number of e-folds. One can easily find the maximum value



FIG. 4. $\Delta\phi$ increases linearly for low values of p and is sub-Planckian for $p < 4$. Here we take three values of ϵ_1^* as obtained from Eq. (11) for three values of β as $\beta = 2.15 \times 10^3, 2.15 \times 10^4, 2.15 \times 10^5$.



FIG. 5. $\Delta\phi$ becomes super-Planckian for $p > 4$ and approaches a maximum value for high values of p. Here we take three values of ϵ_1^* as obtained from Eq. (11) for three values of β as $\beta = 2.15 \times 10^3, 2.15 \times 10^4, 2.15 \times 10^5$.

of the number of e-folds and the field excursion by looking at the limiting tendencies as is apparent from the Eqs. (18) and (20) as p goes to infinity. Let us choose a typical value for $\epsilon_{1*} \approx 10^{-10}$ and find that

$$N_{max} = \lim_{p\to\infty} N = \lim_{p\to\infty} \frac{p\bar{N}_*}{2}\left[1 - \epsilon_{1*}^{1/p}\right] = -\frac{\bar{N}_*}{2}\ln\epsilon_{1*} = 625.99 \tag{21}$$

$$\Delta\phi_{max} = \lim_{p\to\infty} \Delta\phi = \lim_{p\to\infty} \frac{\sqrt{2}}{1-2/p}\bar{N}_*\epsilon_{1*}\left[1 - \epsilon_{1*}^{1-p/2}\right] = \sqrt{2}\bar{N}_*\left[1 - \epsilon_{1*}^{1/2}\right] = 82.02 \tag{22}$$

Let us now summarize the main results obtained for the perturbative class. The above analysis shows that both the field excursion and the number of e-folds increase with increase in p even as n_s and r remain the same. An upper limit on $\Delta\phi$ and N has been achieved asymptotically. For $\epsilon_{1*} = 4.22 \times 10^{-10}$ we get $N = 625.99$ and $\Delta\phi = 82.02$. Field excursion $\Delta\phi$ starts out as sub-Planckian for small values of p ($p < 4$) and then becomes super

Planckian for large values of p. Thus depending on p one can obtain sub-Planckian or super-Planckian field excursion. The range of field excursion varies very mildly or does not change significantly for different values of the parameter ϵ_{1*} at high values of p. This is not the case for number of e-foldings. For example with $\epsilon_{1*} = 4.22 \times 10^{-10},\ p = 99000, \Delta\phi = 82.0045$ but for $\epsilon_{1*} = 4.22 \times 10^{-12}, \Delta\phi = 82.0065$ while N changes significantly from $N = 625.99$ to $N = 759$ for the two cases. The upper limit of $\Delta\phi \approx 82$ for KMIII as a benchmark model is significantly lesser than the upper limit of $\Delta\phi \approx 155.56$ that has been obtained by considering chaotic inflation as the benchmark[7]. The upper limit on N on the contrary is larger for KMIII benchmark with $N \approx 626$ while it is only $N \approx 290$ for chaotic inflation as benchmark. It is important to note that for a given value of r one can get both sub-Planckian and super-Planckian field excursion.

B. Non-perturbative class

The next class that we would like to consider is the non-perturbative models of inflation[10,11] characterised by the Hubble flow parameters which are non-perturbative around $1/N \to 0$.

$$\epsilon_1 = \exp\left(-2cN\right)$$
$$\epsilon_2 = -2c \tag{23}$$

where c is a constant. Equating this with the same parameters of the benchmark model (Eq. 13) we get

$$\frac{b}{2\bar{N}_*^2\sqrt{\ln \bar{N}_*}} = \exp\left[-2cN_*\right] \tag{24}$$

leading to an expression for the constant $c = 1/\bar{N}_*$. We next consider the number of e-folds N between horizon exit and end of inflation. We get N_f by the fact that the first Hubble flow parameter is equal to 1 when inflation ends *i.e.* for $\epsilon_1 = 1$ we have $\exp\left[-2cN_f\right] = 2$ leading to $N_f = 0$. Thus for the non-perturbative case we have $N = N_*$. Using equation (24) we can calculate the number e-foldings remaining at the point of horizon exit as

$$N_* = -\frac{\bar{N}_*}{2}\ln\epsilon_{1*} \tag{25}$$

This in turn gives us the required range of e-foldings as $N = -\frac{\bar{N}_*}{2}\ln\epsilon_{1*}$. We get a startling result for the number of e-folds. Not only is N_f equal to zero for the non-perturbative class but also the final form of the number of e-folds N is the same as the form for the

maximum number of e-folds for the perturbative class (Eq. 21). Apparently the N of the non-perturbative class hits the maximum limit of the number of e-folds for the perturbative class.

Let us next observe the behaviour of field excursion $\Delta\phi$ from Eqs. (7) and (23). The expression for the same is as follows.

$$\Delta\phi = -\sqrt{2}\bar{N}_* \left[\exp\left(-cN_f\right) - \exp\left(-cN_*\right)\right] \tag{26}$$

Inserting the value of N_f and using the Eq. (25) we get

$$\Delta\phi = \sqrt{2}\bar{N}_* \left[1 - \sqrt{\epsilon_{1*}}\right] \tag{27}$$

which is same as that for the maximum limit of $\Delta\phi$ for the perturbative class (Eq. 22). Most significantly what have been obtained for N and $\Delta\phi$ in the non-perturbative class is similar to that in the large p limit of the perturbative class. Furthermore in the non-perturbative case there are not much variation over the different parameters, instead there is one particular value of $\Delta\phi$ and N each for different values of ϵ_{1*} corresponding to the benchmark model KMIII. For non-perturbative case we get super-Planckian field excursion only.

C. Logarithmic class

The other class of model that we intended to explore is the logarithmic one[11] in which the Hubble flow parameters are

$$\begin{aligned} \epsilon_1 &= \kappa \frac{\ln^q N}{N^p} \\ \epsilon_2 &= -\frac{p}{N} + \frac{q}{N \ln N} \end{aligned} \tag{28}$$

where p and the power coefficient q are model specific parameters. We have retained logarithmic correction terms in the generic class. The form of ϵ_2 here is different from that of the benchmark Eqn 10 only in the second term. However as we are working at large N limits we can readily see that the second term of the above equation for ϵ_2 dies down rapidly and we can ignore it's effects compared to the first term of $1/N$ at leading order. Doing that we note that the benchmark that has been chosen here can easily be obtained for the parameter $p = 2$ and keeping leading order contributions of $1/N$. Following similar

techniques as discussed in previous sections we obtain κ by equating the above parameters with that of the benchmark model.

$$\kappa = \frac{b}{2}\frac{N_*^p}{\bar{N}_*^2\sqrt{\ln \bar{N}_*}\ln^q N_*} \tag{29}$$

and

$$\frac{2}{\bar{N}_*} = \frac{p}{N} - \frac{q}{N_* \ln N_*} \tag{30}$$

Given the complicated relations above it is not straightforward to have analytical results for $\Delta\phi$ and N for the logarithmic class of models. The field excursion in this context comes out to be

$$\Delta\phi = \sqrt{2}\kappa \int \frac{\ln^{q/2} N}{N^{p/2}} dN \tag{31}$$

For specific choices of p and q one can infer about the implications of the above expression.

IV. SUMMARY AND DISCUSSIONS

Let us conclude with a few comments. We have emphasized on Planck 2015 data and strong underlying theoretical background in choosing the benchmark model for our analysis. Considering the span of inflaton field profile $\Delta\phi$ for the KMIII model as reference, we have studied how the range of the field excursion varies in different universality classes of inflationary models corresponding to a observationally fixed point in the $n_s - r$ plane. The technique followed in this work has been proposed in the context of chaotic inflation as the benchmark model[7]. However the recent Planck data release rules out values of $r > 0.11$ while for chaotic $r = 0.16$.

KMIII model predicts a spectral index n_s well within the 2σ contour of Planck. This also predicts a negligibly small value of r and as a consequence gives sub-Planckian field excursion. Comparing this with other universality classes of model we found that it is possible to have super-Planckian as well as sub-Planck mass field excursion, for example, for differenet ranges of parameter p in the perturbative class of models. While equating the slow roll parameters at horizon crossing one not only changes ϕ_* but also ϕ_f which are the values of field at the horizon crossing and at the end of inflation respectively. This also changes the value of N_f, the number of e-folds at the end of inflation. Fixing the Hubble flow parameters at horizon crossing for a model amounts to fixing the value of the field variable ϕ_* which in turn changes N_* the number of e-folds at horizon crossing. Basically the demand to get

the same n_s and r as the benchmark models puts a constraint on the theory via the change of N_* and ϕ_* from there original value. This is why we get a range of values for N and $\Delta\phi$ for the same n_s and r. In this analysis with KMIII as benchmark, most interestingly, we have found that one can get sub-Planckian field excursion in the regime of single field slow roll inflation. There appears a maximum value for the field excursion variable and the number of e-folds. Owing to the different geometric form of the potential in the benchmark model we get a distinct limit on the abovementioned parameters. The chaotic model is much steeper so the rolling down velocity of the field is greater than that for the KMIII whose slope is much more flatter leading to a much slower rolling speed. Thus in this case there are more number of e-folds but a smaller value of the maximum field excursion. Interestingly similar results have been observed in non-perturbative class like those in the perturbative class. Finally we see that for the perturbative class the value of $\Delta\phi_{max}$ is almost same for different initial parameters for the benchmark models while the maximum no. of e-folds changes appreciably.

REFERENCES

[1]A. H. Guth, Phys. Rev. **23** , 347 (1981).

[2]A. D. Linde, Phys. Lett. **B108**, 389 (1982).

[3]D. Baumann, Tasi Lectures on Inflation, (2009), hep-th/0907.5424 .

[4]A. D. Liddle and D. H. Lyth, *The Primordial Density Perturbation: Cosmology, Inflation and Large Scale Structure* (Cambridge University Press, 2009).

[5]Planck Collaboration, P. Ade et al, (2015) astro-ph/1502.02114 .

[6]G. N. Remmen, S. M. Carroll, Phys. Rev. **D 90**, 063517 (2014), hep-th/1405.5538 .

[7]J.Garcia-Bellido, D. Roest, M. Scalisi and I. Zavala, JCAP 1409, 006 (2014), hep-th/1405.7399.

[8]A. Linde, M. Noorbala and A. Westphal, JCAP 1103, 013 (2011), hep-th/1101.2652 .

[9]J. Martin, C. Ringeval and V. Vennin, Phys. Dark Univ. 5 - 6 (2014) 75-235, astro-ph.CO/1303.3787 .

[10]D. Roest , JCAP, **1401** , 007(2013), hep-th/ 1309.1285 .

[11]J. Garcia-Bellido, D. Roest, Phys. Rev. **D89**, (2014) 103527, astro-ph/1402.2059 .

[12]Ade et al, Phys. Rev. Lett. **112** , 241101 (2014), astro-ph/1403.3985 .

[13]S. Lee, S. Nam , Int. J. Mod. Phys. , **A26** , (2011) 1073-1096, hep-th/1006.2876 .

[14]J. P. Conlon , F. Quevedo , JHEP **0601** 146 (2006), hep-th/0509012 ; J. R. Bond, L. Kofman, S. Prokushkin, and P. M. Vaudrevange, Phys.Rev. D75 (2007) 123511, hep-th/0612197 ; H. X. Yang and H. L. Ma, JCAP 0808 (2008) 024, hep-th/0804.3653 ; S. Krippendorf and F. Quevedo, JHEP 0911 (2009) 039, hep-th/0901.0683 ; J. J. Blanco-Pillado, D. Buck, E. J. Copeland, M. Gomez-Reino, and N. J. Nunes, JHEP 1001 (2010) 081, hep-th/0906.3711 .

[15]J. R. Bond, L. Kofman, S. Prokushkin, and P. M. Vaudrevange, Phys. Rev. D75 (2007) 123511, hep-th/0612197 ; H.X. Yang and H.L. Ma, JCAP 0808 (2008) 024, hep-th/0804.3653; S. Krippendorf and F. Quevedo, JHEP 0911 (2009) 039, hep-th/0901.0683 ; J. J. Blanco-Pillado, D. Buck, E. J. Copeland, M. Gomez-Reino, and N. J. Nunes, JHEP 1001 (2010) 081, hep-th/0906.3711 ; M. Kawasaki and K. Miyamoto, JCAP 1102 (2011) 004, astro-ph.CO/1010.3095.

[16]Planck Collaboration, P. Ade et al, (2013), astro-ph/1303.5076 .

[17]Martin *et al.*, JCAP, **1403**, 039(2014), astro-ph/1312.3529 .

[18]M. B. Hoffman and M. S. Turner, Phys. Rev. D64 (2001) 023506, astro-ph/0006321 ; D. J. Schwarz, C. A. Terrero-Escalante, and A. A. Garcia, Phys. Lett. B517 (2001) 243249, astro-ph/0106020 .

[19]D. H. Lyth, Phys. Rev. Lett 78, 1861 (1997), hep-ph/9606387.

[20]L. Boubekeur, Phys.Rev. D87 (2013), 061301, astro-ph. CO/1208.0210 .